

REMARKS

Applicant provides the present Amendment to respond to the issues raised in the Official Action mailed March 25, 2004. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 9 and 17 to clarify that embodiments of the present invention provide for translation from a source language to a target language. Applicant has also amended Claims 11 and 12 to correct typographic errors in these claims. Applicant appreciates the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and the objections to the Title and Abstract from the previous Official Action. Applicant submits that the claims are not anticipated by the cited reference for at least the reasons discussed below.

The Anticipation Rejection

Claims 1-28 stand rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 based on United States Patent No. 6,496,844 to Hetherington et al. (hereinafter "Hetherington"). Applicant submits that Hetherington does not disclose the invention recited in Claims 1-28 because Hetherington describes a control that displays phonetic representations of text in different character sets, but does not disclose or suggest the automatic translation of text from a source language to a target language using a reusable control that specifies when translation should be invoked and encapsulates the translation language and when translation should be invoked.

Turning to the specifics of the rejection, the Official Action cites to col. 6, line 45 to col. 8, line 67 and the transliteration engine 220 of Hetherington as disclosing "identifying when translation should be invoked for text in the control" as recited in Claim 1. Official Action, p. 3. The cited portion of Hetherington does not appear to translate the entered text but appears to store in a string either the text as input or a "phonetic representation" of the text. See Hetherington, col. 7, lines 45-55; see also Hetherington, Abstract. Thus, it does not appear that Hetherington translates text from one language to another but provides phonetic representations of words in one character set in a different character set. As such, it does not appear that the cited portion of Hetherington discloses or suggests identifying when translation should be invoked for a text control.

The Official Action also cites to the abstract, Figure 5 and col. 16, line 13 to col. 17, line 11 of Hetherington as disclosing "encapsulating said steps of initializing and identifying in order to make a reusable data object" as recited in Claim 1. Official Action, p. 3. However, the Abstract of Hetherington describes encapsulating "identification, meaning and pronunciation information." Hetherington, Abstract. This encapsulation is not the encapsulation to provide a reusable data object as recited in Claim 1. Furthermore, Figure 5 and the cited portions of col. 16 and 17 of Hetherington describe a control that displays the various strings that provided the characters and phonetic representations of the characters. It does not appear that there is an indication that the control that displays these strings encapsulates "initializing and identifying in order to make a reusable data object" as recited in Claim 1.

In light of the above discussion, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited portions of Hetherington. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Hetherington. Applicant also submits that analogous arguments apply to independent Claims 9 and 17. Applicant also submits that the dependent claims are patentable at least as depending from a patentable base claim.

With regard to Claims 25-28, the Official Action merely states the Claim 25-28 are rejected under the same rationale as Claim 1. However, Claim 25 recites:

25. A control object for controlling text, the control object comprising:
a text property for storing data corresponding to the text to be controlled by the control object;
a translation language property which indicates a language to which the text to be controlled is to be translated; and
a translation method which performs translation of data in the text property.

As discussed above, Hetherington does not appear to translate text into different languages but appears to provide a phonetic representation of the pronunciation of text. As such, Applicant submits that the cited portions of Hetherington do not disclose or suggest the translation as recited in Claim 25. Applicant submits that the recitations of dependent Claims 26-28 are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Hetherington. As such, Applicant submits that Claims 25 to 28 are patentable over Hetherington and, therefore, requests allowance of these claims.

In re: Dennis D. King
Serial No.: 09/407,141
Filed: September 28, 1999
Page 8 of 8

CONCLUSION

In light of the above discussion, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (919) 854-1400.

It is not believed that an extension of time and/or additional fee(s)-including fees for net addition of claims-are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. In the event, however, that an extension of time is necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such an extension is hereby petitioned for under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a). Any additional fees believed to be due in connection with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy J. O'Sullivan
Registration No. 35,632

USPTO Customer No. 20792
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec
Post Office Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: 919/854-1400
Facsimile: 919/854-1401

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 14, 2004.



Traci Brown